

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 3-4 and 10-13 have been amended. Claims 1-2 and 9 have been canceled. Claims 3-8 and 10-13 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 3-4 and 11-13 have been amended to correct typographical errors. Claim 10 has been amended to clarify the invention.

Claims 3-4, 10-11, and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sato et al. (US 6,141,161). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The claimed invention describes writing a magnetic information, then reading the magnetic information, then determining a coercive force. Furthermore, in the claimed invention, if the “reading magnetic information” differs from “writing magnetic information” by the difference in the traveling quantity, the determination means cannot determine a coercive force (*see* page 28, paragraph 140-143 of the specification). To solve this problem, the claimed invention comprises the determination means for determining a coercive force on the basis of the traveling quantity.

On the other hand, Sato et al. discloses determining a coercive force first, then recording and/or reproducing magnetic information. Sato et al. Abstract, Col. Col. 11, ln. 25-30. There is no mention of determining a coercive force on the basis of the traveling quantity.

Claims 3-4 recite, *inter alia*, “traveling quantity detection means for detecting a traveling quantity of the magnetic recording medium; ... [and] a readout head for reading magnetic information on the magnetic recording medium conveyed by the

conveyance means after the write head writes magnetic information on the magnetic recording medium, and determination means for determining a coercive force of the magnetic recording medium on the basis of ... a traveling quantity of the magnetic recording medium at the time of reading" (emphasis added). Sato et al. does not disclose these limitations.

To the contrary, Sato et al. discloses that "before the magnetic information is recorded in the magnetic stripe 101 of the magnetic card 100 by the recording/reproducing magnetic head 121 as described above, the coercive force identifying device 123 identifies (specifies) the coercive force of the magnetic stripe 101 of the magnetic card 100." Col. 11, ln. 25-30 (emphasis added). Sato et al. discloses determining the coercive force of magnetic recording medium, however Sato et al. does not disclose reading magnetic information after the write head writes magnetic information on the magnetic recording medium as recited in claims 3-4.

Additionally, Sato et al. does not disclose determining a coercive force of the magnetic recording medium on the basis of a traveling quantity of the magnetic recording medium at the time of reading as recited in claims 3-4. Since Sato et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claims 3-4, claims 3-4 are not anticipated by Sato et al.

Claim 10, as amended, recites, *inter alia*, "traveling quantity detection means for detecting traveling quantities of the write head and the readout head; ... reading control means ... for causing the readout head to read magnetic information on the magnetic recording medium after the write head writes magnetic information on the magnetic recording medium; and determination means for determining a coercive force of the magnetic recording medium on the basis of a value, which the reading control means uses the readout head to read, and a traveling quantity of the readout head at the time of reading" (emphasis added). Sato et al. does not disclose these limitations.

To the contrary, Sato et al. discloses that “before the magnetic information is recorded in the magnetic stripe 101 of the magnetic card 100 by the recording/reproducing magnetic head 121 as described above, the coercive force identifying device 123 identifies (specifies) the coercive force of the magnetic stripe 101 of the magnetic card 100.” Col. 11, ln. 25-30 (emphasis added). Sato et al. discloses determining the coercive force of magnetic recording medium, however Sato et al. does not disclose causing the readout head to read magnetic information after the write head writes magnetic information, and determining a coercive force of the magnetic recording medium on the basis of a value, which the reading control means uses the readout head to read as recited in claim 10. The claimed invention reads, and therefore determines the coercive force, after writing magnetic information.

Additionally, Sato et al. does not disclose determining a coercive force of the magnetic recording medium on the basis a traveling quantity as recited in claim 10. Since Sato et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claim 10, claim 10 is not anticipated by Sato et al.

Claims 11 and 13 recite, *inter alia*, “traveling quantity detection means for detecting a traveling quantity; [and] determination means for causing the readout head to read magnetic information of the magnetic recording medium, which is moved relative to the readout head, after the write head writes magnetic information on the magnetic recording medium, and determining a coercive force” (emphasis added). Sato et al. does not disclose these limitations.

To the contrary, Sato et al. discloses that “before the magnetic information is recorded in the magnetic stripe 101 of the magnetic card 100 by the recording/reproducing magnetic head 121 as described above, the coercive force identifying device 123 identifies (specifies) the coercive force of the magnetic stripe 101 of the magnetic card 100.” Col. 11, ln. 25-30. Sato et al. discloses determining the

coercive force of magnetic recording medium, however Sato et al. does not read magnetic information after the write head writes magnetic information on the magnetic recording medium, and determining a coercive force as recited in claims 11 and 13. Since Sato et al. does not disclose all the limitations of claims 11 and 13, claims 11 and 13 are not anticipated by Sato et al.

Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 3-4, 10-11, and 13 be withdrawn.

Claims 5-8 and 12 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 5-8 and 12 depend, respectively, directly, or indirectly from independent claims 4 and 11, and are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO MORIN &
OSHINSKY LLP

2101 L Street NW

Washington, DC 20037-1526

(202) 785-9700

Attorneys for Applicants